

## **REMARKS**

The Specification has been amended. Claims 23 - 24 and 30 - 33 have been amended.

Claims 34 - 47 have been added. No new matter has been introduced with these amendments or added claims, all of which are supported in the specification as originally filed. Claims 23 - 24 and 30 - 47 are now in the application.

### **I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

Paragraphs 4 - 6 of the Office Action dated May 31, 2006 (hereinafter, “the Office Action”) state that Claims 23 - 24, 30 - 31, and 32 - 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Appropriate amendments have been made herein to clarify the claim language discussed in these paragraphs of the Office Action, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the §112 rejection.

### **II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Paragraph 8 of the Office Action states that Claims 23 - 24 and 30 - 34 [note, should say 33] are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent Publication 2004/0128516 to Okamoto et al. (hereinafter, “Okamoto”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 23, 30, and 32 have been amended herein to more clearly specify the “for each transfer” aspects recited therein. As amended, Claim 23 specifies:

A computer program product for providing an auditable trail of product

transfers, the computer program product embodied on one or more computer-readable media and comprising:

computer-readable program code for computing, for each transfer of a particular product, a globally-unique identifier for the transfer and a cryptographic signature over one or more values describing the transfer;

computer-readable program code for recording, for each of the transfers, the cryptographic signature, the globally-unique identifier, and zero or more of the values in a product-integral ownership repository on the particular product;

computer-readable program code for recording an audit record for each of the transfers in an audit repository, wherein the audit record for each of the transfers comprises the cryptographic signature, the globally-unique identifier, and the one or more values describing the transfer; and

computer-readable program code for tracing transfers of the particular product using each of the audit records that pertains to the particular product.  
(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that Okamoto fails to teach (at least) the above-underlined recitations of Claim 23. In particular, Applicants find no teaching, nor any suggestion, in Okamoto of: (1) “computing, for each transfer of a particular product, a globally-unique identifier for the transfer ...” (Claim 23, lines 4 - 6, emphasis added) and (2) “recording, for each of the transfers, ... in a product-integral ownership repository on the particular product” (Claim 23, lines 9 - 11, emphasis added). The paragraphs of Okamoto cited in the Office Action as teaching the limitations of these elements of Applicants’ claims will now be discussed.

The cited paragraph [0044] specifies that “information associated with the ticket is stored on the ticket as indicium”, and the Office Action refers to a “ticket ID” when discussing this paragraph. However, in contrast to Applicants’ claim language, a “ticket ID” is not a globally-unique identifier computed for each transfer of a product/ticket; instead, the ticket ID would remain unchanged across all transfers of that ticket.

Whereas Applicants' claim language specifies that a cryptographic signature and a globally-unique identifier computed for each transfer are recorded on the particular product for each transfer of the product (Claim 23, lines 9 - 11), the cited paragraph [0047] specifies that "a unique digital signature for each transaction" and "other ticket content and/or demographic information" are recorded on the ticket. There is no teaching, nor any suggestion, that this "other ticket content and/or demographic information" comprises a globally-unique identifier computed for the transfer, in contrast to Applicants' claim language.

The cited paragraph [0050] specifies that "the ticket comprises secure content that contains a digital signature and/or any other information requested or required by the ticket service system. The secure ticket content comprises information that relates to the transaction being performed.". However, there is no teaching nor any suggestion that this "any other information" or "information that relates to the transaction" comprises a globally-unique identifier computed for the transfer, in contrast to Applicants' claim language.

The cited paragraph [0061] pertains to the transaction and ticket database **214**, which is separate and distinct from the ticket. See, for example, **Fig. 2**, where the ticket is shown at **208** and the transaction & ticket database **214** is shown as part of the Secure Transaction Service System **200**. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that paragraph [0061] is not relevant to the claim limitations for "recording ... in a product-integral ownership repository on the particular product" (Claim 23, lines 9 - 11, emphasis added).

When discussing the “globally-unique identifier”, the Office Action refers to an identifier for the ticket. (Office Action, paragraph 8, lines 4 - 5 and Office Action, p. 4, lines 12 - 16.) Applicants’ claim language specifies, by contrast, that the globally-unique identifier is computed for the transfer of the product (Claim 23, line 5), and that this computing is performed for each transfer of the product (Claim 23, line 4), and that the globally-unique identifier for each transfer is recorded on the product (Claim 23, lines 9 - 11). Applicants respectfully submit that this is patentably distinct from Okamoto’s ticket ID that remains constant for all transactions performed upon a particular ticket.

Independent Claims 30 and 32 specify limitations analogous to those of Claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Okamoto fails to render their independent Claims 23, 30, and 32 obvious. These claims are therefore deemed patentable over the reference. Dependent Claims 24, 31, and 33 are therefore deemed patentable over the reference as well. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §103 rejection.

### III. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections, and allowance of all remaining claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

/Marcia L. Doubet/ /#40,999/

Cust. Nbr. for Corr.: 43168  
Phone: 407-343-7586

Marcia L. Doubet, Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 40,999